



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,580	08/21/2003	Anil K. Nori	MSFT-2735/305642.01	9948
41505	7590	10/03/2007		
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)			EXAMINER	
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR			CORRIELUS, JEAN M	
2929 ARCH STREET				
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/03/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/646,580

Applicant(s)

NORI ET AL.

Examiner

Jean M. Corrielus

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 25-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 25-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to the Request Continued Examination (RCE) filed on July 23, 2007, in which claims 1-9 and 25-38 are presented for further examination.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on July 27, 2007 complies with the provisions of M.P.E.P 609. It has been placed in the application file. The information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 and 25-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by amendment.

#### **Remark**

4. For the purpose of examination claims 1-9 and 25-38 will examine using **"an Item"**, wherein the data store comprises at least one of the following: an Item, an Element, and a Relationship. Applicant admitted that at least one limitation and not all limitations needed in order for the claimed limitations to be realized.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2162

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agrawal et al., (hereinafter "Agrawal") US Patent no. 6,324,533 and Martin US Patent no. 6,704,743.

As to claim 1, Agrawal is directed to a system for mining relationship from the integrated mining system in a form of query to SQL engines enhanced with object relational extensions (col.2, lines 33-36). In particular the claimed "a data store that comprises an item (item is an object, col.2, lines 40-60; col.4, line 66; col.5, lines 5-20), wherein said Item is a unit of data storable in a data store" (wherein the object is stored in a medium, col.8, lines 2-18). However, Agrawal does not explicitly disclose "a Base Schema that establishes a framework for creating and organizing each Item; and a Core Schema that defines a set of core types, wherein each Item is characterized into at least one core type based on the Item type or the Item subtype, the characterizations being stored in the data store".

On the other hand, Martin discloses an entity management system using the concept of database seeding. However, the core schema disclosed by Martin is not configured to include at its most basic level the concept of object inheritance, but such concept is introduced by creating

Art Unit: 2162

a parent definition entity in the database as a way to define the characteristics of a parent relationship between a parent and child entity (see fig.61). In particular, Martin discloses the claimed “a Base Schema that establishes a framework for creating and organizing each Item” by creating a parent definition entity in the database as a way to define the characteristics of a parent relationship between a parent and child entity (see fig.61); “a Core Schema that defines a set of core types, wherein each Item is characterized into at least one core type based on the Item type or the Item subtype, the characterizations being stored in the data store” (col.25, lines 26-37). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use such modification for the purpose of minimizing the performance impact of changes to the structure of parent entities.

As to claim 2, Agrawal discloses the claimed “a plurality of Items, said plurality of Items comprising an Item Folder and at least one other Item that is a member of said Item Folder” (col.9, lines 25-60).

As to claim 3, Agrawal discloses the claimed “a plurality of Items, said plurality of Items comprising a Category and at least other one Item that is a member of said Category” (col.12, lines 48-55).

As to claim 4, Agrawal discloses the claimed “wherein a Relationship between two Items is established automatically by a hardware/Software interface system” (col.7, lines 15-60). (This

Art Unit: 2162

claim should not be part of the rejection because is not selection from at least claimed element in claim 1)

As to claim 5, discloses the claimed “wherein said Element is understandable by a hardware/software interface system.” (col.8, lines 8-18). (This claim should not be part of the rejection because is not selection from at least claimed element in claim 1)

As to claim 6, discloses the claimed “a second Element, and wherein said Relationship comprises said second Element” (col.7, lines 15-25). (This claim should not be part of the rejection because is not selection from at least claimed element in claim 1)

As to claim 7, Martin discloses the claimed a Core Schema to define a set of Core Items by which a hardware/software interface system understands and directly processes said set of Core Items in a predetermined and predictable way (col.25, lines 26-37).

As to claim 8, Martin discloses the claimed “ wherein each Item from the set of Core Items is derived (directly or indirectly) from a Common Single Base Item” ((col.25, lines 26-37)).

As to claim 9, Martin discloses the claimed “wherein said Common Single Base Item is a foundational Item in a Base Schema” ((col.25, lines 26-37)).

As to claim 25-31:

Art Unit: 2162

Claims 25-31 are computer readable medium with computer readable instructions for performing the data store of the method claims 1-9 above. They are, therefore, rejected under the same rationale.

As to claim 32-38:

Claims 32-38 are computer system for performing the data store of the method claims 1-9 above. They are, therefore, rejected under the same rationale.

### *Conclusion*

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean M. Corrielus whose telephone number is (571) 272-4032. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 hours shift.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/646,580

Page 7

Art Unit: 2162

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jean M Corrielus". The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping initial "J" and a long, horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Jean M Corrielus  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2162

September 26, 2007